underground

6100 North 26th Street Arlington, Virginia 22207

November 14, 1966

Mr Harold Weisberg
Hyattstown,.Maryland

Dear Mr Weisberg,

Enclosed is a copy of the current issue in which the parts of the interview with you appear.

A complete transcript will be sent to you as soon as possible.

I would like to thank you again for the opportunity to talk with you and the hospitality which you showed me.

I read in the current issue of BOOKS that Della will be distributing Whitewash. I congratulate you and hope you sell a lot more books that way. I'm sure mass distribution will give your book the audience which it needs and the attention it deserves.

Sincerely,

Tom

Thomas De Baggio
editor/publisher

VOL. 1 / NO. 4 Copyright 1966 by UNDERGROUND Wednesday, November 16, 1966 20 cents

underground

THE KENNEDY AUTOPSY PICTURES:

"The best these pictures can do is prove that one less lie was told." PAGE 3

Bozart Politics (conclusion)

see page 5

WORLD WAR III will be the best thing which could ever have happened to the world of civilized people. ON PAGE 9

The Intersection IS The Game (the diggers)

page 6

MORE ON AESTHETIC REALISM

see page 11

Peace Groups Plan December Protests

The War Resisters International and the International Confederation for Disarmament and Peace have issued an appeal to peace organizations throughout the world to engage in a wide range of public protest on December 10, United Nations Human Rights Day.

The protests are to be directed against U.S. actions in Vietnam and in support of a possible Christmas cease-fire.

It now seems likely that December 10 will mark the most massive world-wide protest against the war in Vietnam which has yet been staged.

The fact that Pope Paul will almost certainly issue a special appeal for a Christmas cease - fire was also sighted as a reason for the December 10 date.

World-wide pressure for the United States government to accept that cease-fire could provide the first concrete step toward peace since the temporary lull in fighting last year.

The Vietnamese festival of Tet comes immediately after Christmas and there is a chance that a Christmas cease-fire would be extended through Tet.

If it were possible to enforce an end of bombing and shooting for even so brief

CONTINUED ON PAGE 2

BULLET IMAGERY BOMB EDITION

WEISBERG INTERVIEW

Harold Weisberg, author of Whitewash, a book critical of the Warren Commission Report, gave Underground this exclusive interview early this month. Sitting in the kitchen of his Hyattstown, Md., farmhouse, Mr Weisberg talked at length on his book and other recently published books critical of the Warren Commission conclusions. The following are edited excerpts from that interview.

WEISBERG, WHITEWASH,
THE OTHER CRITICS

I have a unique approach in my work. I restrict myself one hundred percent to the official evidence. I don't pretend to be James Bond and I'm not. I would say that the Commission's best evidence proves that Oswald could have killed no one. I'll go farther in this particular case because of the continuing work I've done in this field since I wrote the book and I'll say that I'm also satisfied that this best evidence is absolutely unassailable.

I don't think anybody has added materially to what I finished in mid-February 1965. I don't think collectively they approach what I did. Thirty to forty percent of my book is not duplicated by any other of the works. Where there are differences, these are differences in emphasis. For example, Epstein's book is really two things. It's an enlargement of my introduction and it serves its own kind of importance that way. But the essence of what he said, I said.

My book was a hundred and ten thousand words. I had a contract for a hundred thousand words. I had to leave a lot of stuff out. I elected not to be interested to any great degree in the things Mr Epstein was interested in, simply because I think they're obvious to the average person who knows how government functions and because I thought the other things I had to say were more important.

What he's added was the opinions of some people. Unfortunately — and I think it is a reflection more of the immaturity of his professor than of Epstein— he never realized that he was becoming the creature of those who were giving him information. What he has is quite biased. Wesley J. Liebeler immerges as a hero in Epstein's book. I have read and studied the careers of very few people who are less heroic than Wesley Liebeler. And I have not seen the functioning of many people who were as interested as Wesley Liebeler in having Epstein say what Epstein said.

Epstein never questioned this apparently. He's a young man and has spent much of his time studying. I think it's quite understandable that a man who hasn't been knocked around by life quite a bit might not think of these things. I find it a lot less understandable that this eminent professor who was his mentor didn't immediately wonder. No cub reporter would have been fooled this way, simply because he would have asked the inevitable question: Why. Why was Wesley Liebeler spilling his guts and rifling files for Epstein?

He also has the FBI report in his book. Now this is something I believe everybody but me has sadly mishandled. All the publishers have made a great mystery out of it. All the mercenary rascals have claimed for their authors that this is a great discovery he made. Holt, Rinehart and Winston deliberately misrepresented that Mark Lane had discovered the FBI report. Mark Lane didn't even see it until after it was in publication in my book. I didn't discover the FBI report. Nobody discovered it.

The truth is before anybody ever saw it, I had a dozen references to it in my book because it was very carefully leaked by the Government. They didn't leak one hundred percent of it but they actually leaked the essence of it to make the story credible. It's for this reason that I have these references throughout my book. The first actual publication of the words of the text that I know of was by Vincent Salandria. The first actual publication in facsimile was by me. So far as I know neither Salandria nor I were, on our own, claiming any great deal for it. But everybody else who's come after us has.

They've all misused it because they all use it as primary evidence of the autopsy. This is simply because they're lazy workers. It's not evidence on the autopsy at all. It's secondary at best. The others are using it as a substitute for having really analyzed the autopsy story and the testimony of the autopsy doctors and all the other doctors. This I did. In my book, Whitewash, the FBI report is nothing but a postscript. I think in perspective it asks questions about the FBI rather than about the Commission. I am alone in thinking this.

This brings up the entire question of approach. There are a lot of us who say the Commission was wrong. It is not a fiction that I address myself to the re-

CONTINUED ON PAGE 4

KENNEDY PIX 'GREEK GIFT'

The author of a controversial book critical of the Warren Commission Report has said that the best that pictures and X-rays of the autopsy performed on John F. Kennedy "can do is prove that one less lie was told."

Harold Weisberg, author of the recent book Whitewash — the Report on the Warren Report, labeled the photos and X-rays, a recent gift by the Kennedy family to the National Archives, a "Greek gift."

"You know the phrase," he said. "Beware of Greeks bearing gifts."

The pictures, examined by Doctors James J. Humes and J. Thornton Boswell, both of whom were present at the autopsy of the assassinated President, will not be available to the general public.

Already the pictures and X-rays are being used to discredit critics of the Commission's one bullet theory. The Commission relied on testimony from the autopsy doctors and did not view the X-rays or photos. Dr. Humes after evaluating the recent Kennedy family gift said that "the pictures showed just what we testified to."

Mr Weisberg maintains that the pictures "are entirely exaggerated in importance." They will not affect criticism of the Commission conclusion that Lee Harvey Oswald alone committed the assassination, he says.

The Commission made a "quasi-judicial determination," Mr Weisberg insists, "based on pure speculation that a bullet went through President Kennedy's body, through the neck, from back to front, without hitting a bone. Now, if it hit no bone, what is the X-ray going to show."

"The pictures are the important evidence," Mr Weisberg said. But he insisted that the pictures are important only because they can show where there was a hole. "At this point," he said, "once the body was accessible to people, unless there is a tight chain of evidence that proves that no liberties were taken with it, it's not even possible to tell whether the wound was one of entry or exit." ##

from page 3

WEISBERG INTERVIEW

port. There is a distinction between the report and the Commission. I am alone in this.

It is not a fiction to say that there is a real difference in limiting yourself one hundred percent to what's in the official evidence.

Mark Lane can go down to Dallas with camera crews and tape recorders and interview all sorts of people. This is legitimate journalism. He can come up with some dramatic stuff. By this time he's found the taste of honey so good that he doesn't give a damn whether it's accurate or not. That's fine for him. If he wants to do that, that's his business. It certainly has — with the help of a lot of people and a lot of money and a competent publisher — made a very successful and profitable book.

There are a lot of good things to be said for the Lane book. The thing that impresses me the most is the really superb editing. I don't usually follow this sort of thing closely but the editing job that was done on that was little short of a masterpiece.

THE FALSE OSWALD

Would you be interested in knowing how the Commission addresses itself to the false Oswald? It is mentioned in the report. They had evidence they tried to avoid. When I say they I mean it in a broader sense, everybody.

The FBI had a full field investigation completed by December 18, 1963. I've seen that report. So far as the records show, they dropped it. They actually continued nibbling away a little bit, but not anything serious.

The Commission knew about it because the Commission had this FBI report and other related reports. They waited until about 3 weeks before it was to be handed to the President and then, Mr Rankin, the Commission's General Counsel, asked the FBI to look into the story.

There was a man representing himself, according to the testimony, as Lee Harvey Oswald right before the assassination in Dallas. Now at that time there was hardly a less important man in the world than Lee Harvey Oswald. Why should anybody want to counterfeit him?

In a monumental non sequitur, which is what the report is, the most astronomical non sequitur is the one with which the Commission disposed of the evidence it just couldn't ignore any longer. The report says that the Commission is satisfied that this could not have been Lee Harvey Oswald. They knew he was in Mexico at that time. Which, of course, is precisely the point.

The name of this "false Oswald" that Mr Hoover gave the Commission was William Seymour, a westerner, who was at approximately that time known to have been in Dallas. It is not known for sure that it was in fact William Seymour who impersonated Oswald.

A RIGHTIST CONSPIRACY?

As the Chief Justice himself indicated before he was on the Commission, a lot of people believe the radical right were involved in what happened in Texas. These are messianic people. They think that only they understand. They have the word direct from God. The most Godly thing in the world to do is to do just exactly what they think.

I'm not saying that they did it, but this is the type of thinking I've seen. So, you've got all of this kind of thing in addition, now, that you didn't have a few years ago. There are any number of political angles that could have been. My own belief continues to be the Cuban refugees are involved.

ACCIDENTS OF EVIDENCE: A DISTINCTION BETWEEN COMMISSION AND REPORT

In the common reference the Commission by most people is taken to mean the members of the Commission. I think we have to distinguish between the members of the Commission and the combination of the members and those under them and the separation from the members of the staff. Because of the unique nature of this Commission you have to decide in your own mind what is the staff. In my opinion the staff was whoever worked for the Commission, in whatever capacity. Otherwise the Commission had no investigators; only lawyers and clerks. Obviously it had investigators. The FBI gave it some 15 thousand reports. As far as I'm concerned, the FBI is part of the Commission staff so far as it functioned for the Commission. Same is true of the Secret Service and other agencies, to a lesser degree the CIA.

While I think the members of the Commission, all of whom are worldly and experienced men, as men go much wiser than average, should have had serious misgivings about the document to which they put their names, I don't think any of them deliberately set out to put his name to a lie or to tell a lie. I think they found themselves the captives of the situation.

The question of the staff and its relation to the Commission is a large one. In the appendix of my book on pages 202 and 203, I have a photograph that appears on page 113 of the report. That photograph is represented in the report as being the photograph taken in Dallas at the time of the assassination by James W. Altgens, an Associated Press photographer and a quite experienced man. It is part of the sequence of events. The President had been hit but had not yet been killed when this picture was taken.

Across the top of both pages, I have a photograph that IS the photograph taken by James W. Altgens. If you'll notice the part of the original picture as it appears on page 203 above the one from the report is totally missing from the one in the report. That's almost half the picture. The picture that I use there I got from the Associated Press when they were still maintaining that they couldn't find the original negative. They have since found it. Even the one on the top is not the total negative. I have since gotten the total negative. It took about a year of a lot of

CONTINUED ON PAGE 12

WHITEWASH NUMBER 2: WHO KILLED KENNEDY!

Q. Mr Weisberg, I understand you are finishing your second book on the Kennedy Assassination. I assume that Whitewash Two is not a recanting of your heresy in dissenting from the Warren Commission conclusions. Is the new book a refinement of the arguments in the first book or does it present new evidence and findings?

A. It's really both. The book's divided into three parts. The first part picks up many loose ends from Whitewash, carries them foreward and advances the story content. In so doing it also introduces new evidence and new elements of proof. The subtitle of the new book really tells the story. The subtitle is Who did it! Exclamation point. It's not a question. It's very specific and very positive.

Q. It does name names?

A. Indeed it does.

Q. Are these people that have been overlooked in the questioning of the Warren Commission?

A. No. No, there are very few new characters introduced.

Q. Were these people in conspiracy to kill Kennedy?

A. I don't think there was any accident in Kennedy's death. Certainly no one man in the world could have done it. If there's any one thing that the Commission proved overwhelmingly, it's that Lee Harvey Oswald could not have done it.

Q. Could not have done it, or could not have done it alone?

A. Could not have participated in any shooting. This is not to say that he was not involved in some way. I have my own very definite ideas about that but since I won't conjecture in this field, I won't mention it. I think the Commission's best evidence, as Whitewash overwhelmingly proves, is that Oswald could have killed nobody.

from page 11

AESTHETICS AND FEELING BAD

are bass and treble, low or high, thick and thin, they are opposites. There! — we come to the definition of aesthetics. Aesthetics is the study of how opposites in the world, seen or apprehended as one, make for the situation or feeling of beauty.

If we see a man strong as to his wife, but graceful, too — along with seeing fortunate domesticity, we see aesthetics also.

With the definition of aesthetics, we come again to the questions I stated earlier, or rather, implied earlier. Do people want to be aesthetic in their lives? Do they have to be aesthetic? Do people want to put opposites together in their lives? Do they have to put opposites together in their lives?

Aesthetic Realism says, Yes.

The reason is, at its beginning, the nature of the world, the structure of reality. The world is an inextricable co-presence of opposites; reality is an endless simultaneity of opposites.

The first thing everyone wants is not to feel bad. Feeling bad has two main causes; the cause outside yourself, and the cause which is you.

Criticism of self is chiefly concerned with how, while wanting to take care of ourselves, be good to ourselves, protect ourselves, make ourselves important, we do that we don't like ourselves for, and which is against ourselves.

The chief cause of feeling bad, arising from ourselves, is our tendency or desire to separate ourselves from the world. This desire or tendency to separate ourselves from the world is the same as guilt. In so far as a child has the likelihood of separating himself from the world he already is critical of himself, or incipiently guilty. If this seems to heavy a thing to say of a young, young person — well, one should see some of the signs of dissatisfaction an infant can show with his very self — not just with his mother or father.

While, then, our relation with the world is not all that is should be — or we want it to be — and these are the same thing in the early run and the long run — we are critical of ourselves. And we should know where we are.

Feeling bad in man, as something caused by himself, is dissatisfaction with self accompanied by a fear of changing to meet this dissatisfaction or a disinclination to do so.

We want to change very much, but we also think it is disgraceful to do so.

We think we are imperfect, but we think it would be humiliating hell to admit it, see it.

There is nothing we want more than to be other or different. There is nothing we dislike more.

Man hasn't made up his mind about this. So he feels bad.

Before man can be happy, he has to see his desire to change as something he is proud of. He has to see his discernment or awareness of imperfection as pride.

There are now two opposites, desperate opposites, with us: man's untiring inclination to be pleased with himself, or complacency; and man's untiring displeasure with himself, his desire to be other than he is.

These two desires of man are akin to classicism and romanticism in art, inertia and motion in physics, structure and activity in biology, sameness and change in the world itself.

To be pleased with our desire to change, is to be a good critic of ourselves. To be in bliss with our restless desire for improvement is to put the opposites of self-satisfaction and self-questioning together.

It is an aesthetic situation. When we have it we like it.

The next time, then, we feel good, aesthetics will be around — as it is around when a picture is well painted, a concerto well made, a poem well fashioned, a dance well thought out, a drama truly come to. ##

from page 4

WEISBERG INTERVIEW

letter writing. It tells a shocking story. The picture can destroy the entire report. I have no doubt in my mind that it does.

Somebody on the Commission's staff took a scissors out and cut off what he didn't like. I can't for one minute believe that Senator Russell had his secretary do it, or that Earl Warren brought the scissors in from his wife's sewing kit and he did it. I'd be much more inclined to believe that the members of the Commission had no idea that there was anything to the picture except what they saw, what the staff gave them.

Here is another example. The true story of the autopsy report is that the first copy was burned. Everybody else working in the field including the eminent historians are just unwilling to take the time it takes to trace these things out. You'll find that I also have in my book — and this is the first public use of it in facsimile form — on page 187, the certification of Dr. Humes that he burned the document described with a number. He says that these were certain preliminary rough notes.

It doesn't tell the whole story. What he swore he burned is not described in that certification. He swore he burned the first draft of the President's autopsy.

We have a second draft of the autopsy. I've gone through the existing hand written draft and in my book I have four excerpts but they are the difference between day and night, high and low, up and down, back and front. They contain substantive changes and not editorial changes. Some of them happened by magic and some of them happened by design.

You'll notice the word puncture wound is stricken through with fair regularity but not so heavily that you can't read it clearly. In the second line of the first paragraph, Dr Humes says the doctor in charge in Dallas noticed a puncture wound in the lower anterior neck of the President approximately mid-line. This very clearly says as of two days after the assassination the doctor in charge of the autopsy was still saying that the doctors in Dallas told him that the President was shot from the front.

As of this moment the entire story changed and when those doctors testified before the Commission they were hornswoggled, bamboozled, pressured — you name it. Some of them were resolute men and wouldn't change their stories, but most of them found ways of evading, of hemming and hawing. I think that historically there may be a judgment that some of them found it possible to commit perjury. The Commission didn't care about perjury. In fact it depends on some.

When this language "puncture wound of the lower anterior neck" which you see in that paragraph is not stricken through was typed there was some magic — and the Commission depends also on magic. That word puncture was replaced by the words "second, much smaller." I don't know whether the stenographer did it on her own or whether somebody was standing behind her. In any event the Commission was totally without concern about the substantive alterations in this autopsy report. This is, I think, the most important kind of evidence because it happens that Dr Humes was an expert in forensic medicine.

SUBSCRIPTION ORDER FORM

name
address
city state zip

Send to UNDERGROUND 6100 North 26th Street Arlington, Virginia 22207